

County of Loudoun
Department of Planning
MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 30, 2010

TO: The Loudoun County Planning Commission

FROM: Michael "Miguel" Salinas, Project Manager
CPAM 2009-0001: Route 28 Keynote Employment Policies

SUBJECT: Revised Draft Route 28 Corridor Plan

Staff has revised the draft Route 28 Corridor Plan based on Planning Commission direction given at the December 8, 2010 worksession (See the attached draft plan dated January 5, 2011). Below are updates of the Key Topics provided at the previous worksession. Further updates include:

- A. The Office of Transportation Services is still working with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to provide a general indication of the transportation network's ability to accommodate the proposed changes in land use. The types of data to be produced would include overall trip generation, available capacity of the road network, and other measures.
- B. The Planning Commission recommended that the creation of a Route 28 Design Review Board be added to the list of Key Topics. This topic has been added to the design section below.
- C. The Board of Supervisors Public Hearing on the draft plan amendment is tentatively scheduled for February 7, 2011. It is not necessary for the Commission to certify the plan amendment prior to the Board's Public Hearing.
- D. Lastly, there were additional comments submitted from Commissioners that are being reviewed by Staff. An additional Planning Commission worksession on January 11, 2011 is anticipated where these additional comments will be discussed.

A. Mixed-Use Office Centers (MUCs)

I. Topic Summary: Size of MUCs

A Planning Commission recommendation was to limit Mixed-Use Office Centers to a “core development” between 50 and 150 acres in size, plus “add-on developments” not to exceed 200 acres. Staff recommended limiting Mixed-Use Office Centers to a maximum of 90 acres (as specified in the September 3, 2010 staff draft). Staff was concerned that the proposal to double the maximum area for a Mixed-Use Office Center would result in significant increases in capital facility impacts to the County. The 50 to 90 acre size requirement was also developed based on research from other mixed-use developments in the region and limiting the size of these types of developments would ensure that the Route 28 Corridor will remain an employment- focused corridor.

CURRENT PROPOSAL:

Based on direction from the Planning Commission at the December 8, 2010 worksession, Staff amended the draft plan to:

- Allow up to 90 contiguous acres of Mixed-Use Office Centers to occur within three Mixed-Use Office Center development envelopes. The Land Development Patterns map was revised to reflect the boundaries of the development envelopes;
- Consider a Mixed-Use Office Center “core” proposal of at least 50 buildable acres, but no more than 90 acres, within a development envelope that generally complies with the land use mix ratios indicated in the plan for Mixed-Use Office Centers provided;
- Consider an addition to Mixed-Use Office Centers on a case-by-case basis provided the addition is adjacent to and contiguous with the core development, is well-integrated, conforms to the base design standards for Mixed-Use Office Centers, and does not cause the aggregate acreage of the center to exceed 90 acres in size;
- Allow additions to the Mixed-Use Office Center core development to vary from the land use mix provided the aggregate Mixed-Use Office Center acreage still complies with the recommended ratios; and
- Not support a Mixed-Use Office Center proposal that extends beyond the northern and southern boundaries of the Mixed-Use Office Center development envelopes.

II. Topic Summary: MUCs Land Use Mix

A Planning Commission recommendation was to change the land use mix table for Mixed-Use Office Centers to the following:

Office	60-80%
Commercial Retail and Services	10-30% (No change)
High Density Residential	0-20%
Public and Civic	5% - No Maximum (No change)

The 15 to 25 percent High-Density Residential component of the land use mix recommended by Staff was based on research from other mixed-use developments in the region. In order to maintain Route 28 as an employment-focused corridor, Staff recommended the 25 percent maximum was appropriate. Similarly the 15 percent minimum was proposed to ensure a mixture of uses, promoting the 24/7 activity typically absent from Office Cluster developments. Staff also agreed with increasing the minimum percentage for Office uses to 60 percent to ensure that the predominant component of a Mixed-Use Office Center was truly Office. Staff also suggested providing no maximum for Office uses as the maximum amount is dependent on whether the minimums or maximums of the other land use components are met. To compensate for the increase in Office uses, Commercial Retail and Service uses would have to be reduced from a maximum of 30 percent to 20 percent. In addition, Staff recommended reducing the amount of Public and Civic uses to 2 percent of the proposed square footage.

CURRENT PROPOSAL:

Based on direction from the Planning Commission at the December 8, 2010 worksession, Staff amended the draft plan to:

- Require a minimum 55% of the recommended land use mix square footage for Office uses;
- Require the recommended land use mix square footage for Commercial Retail and Services to be at or between 10% and 20%;
- Require the recommended land use mix square footage for Residential to be at or between 15% and 25%; and
- Require at least 2% of the recommended land use mix square footage for Public and Civic uses to be provided on-site, and an additional 3% to be provided either on-site or off-site.

B. Commercial Retail and Service Uses: Hotels

I. Topic Summary

A Planning Commission recommendation was to consider destination full-service hotels as an Office use. Staff recommended retaining hotel uses as fulfilling the Commercial Retail and Service use component of the land use mix as a destination, full-service hotel is supportive of the Office use and should not reduce the potential for Office development in the Route 28 Corridor.

CURRENT PROPOSAL:

Based on direction from the Planning Commission at the December 8, 2010 worksession, Staff amended the draft plan to:

- Include hotel uses as a Commercial Retail & Services land use category;
- Allow Mixed-Use Office Centers that propose Destination, Full-Service Hotels to exceed the maximum 20% Commercial Retail and Services recommended in the land use mix ratios; and

- Allow Destination, Full-Service hotels immediately adjacent to Route 28 to support such uses within the corridor.

C. Design

I. Topic Summary: Wording of policies

A Planning Commission recommendation was to strengthen the requirements in the design section. For example, changing all the environmental resources “should be preserved” to all the environmental resources “are preserved”. Staff recommended the language allow for flexibility in design, as the proposed Design Policies, similar to the Design Guidelines in Chapter 11 of the Revised General Plan, are meant to be flexible, rather than regulatory, to accommodate different types of development and innovative design.

CURRENT STATUS:

The Planning Commission has two options to consider. Option A is to strengthen the requirements in the design section by incorporating the Planning Commission recommendations. Option B is to retain the existing language to allow for flexibility in design. While Staff continues to prefer flexibility, Staff is supportive of either option and looks to the Planning Commission for further direction.

II. Planning Commission Recommendation: Parking

Suggest requiring a certain percentage of parking in Mixed-Use Office Centers to be structured parking at full build-out.

Staff Recommendation: Parking

The proposed policies call for parking within Mixed-Use Office Centers to consist primarily of structured parking at full build-out. Proposed policies also state that surface parking should be avoided except for on-street parking and as needed on an interim basis in the early phases of development. Staff does not have data to support what percentage of structured parking at full build-out would be reasonable and recommends keeping the requirement that parking will consist primarily of structured parking at full build-out.

CURRENT STATUS:

The topic is still up for discussion.

III. Planning Commission Recommendation: Route 28 Design Review Board

Suggest the establishment of the Route 28 Design Review Board by the Board of Supervisors to administer and enforce the design standards.

Staff Recommendation: Route 28 Design Review Board

Staff supports a Coordinated Review Committee, comprised of representatives from various County agencies, to ensure consistency with the Land Use design

controls and standards established both in the plan and in the zoning ordinance. This recommendation was included in the Implementation policies of the draft plan distributed for the December 8, 2010 Planning Commission Worksession.

CURRENT STATUS:

The topic is up for discussion.

D. Parks and Open Spaces and Public and Civic Uses

I. Planning Commission Recommendation: Civic Uses Definition

Revise the definition for civic uses to state that a civic use will consist of not-for-profit organizations that are dedicated to any “exempt purpose”, as defined in Internal Revenue Code section 503(c)(3).

Staff Recommendation: Civic Uses Definition

Staff recommends revising the civic use definition to be more concise rather than reference federal code requirements. The revised language as proposed in the December 8, 2010 draft policies also permits for-profit structures to be included in the civic use component of the land use mix on a case-by-case basis (for example, a performing arts center).

CURRENT STATUS:

The topic is still up for discussion.

II. Planning Commission Recommendation: Land Use Mix Table

Include Parks and Open Space in the land use mix table.

Staff Recommendation: Land Use Mix Table

The land use mix tables for the Route 28 Corridor Plan vary from the land use mix tables currently in the Revised General Plan as they are a percentage of the total square footage rather than land area. A percentage of square footage was chosen for the Route 28 Corridor Plan to accommodate the vertical integration of uses. Parks and Open Spaces are recommended to still be calculated based on a percentage of the land area. Therefore, Staff recommends keeping this requirement as a separate policy.

CURRENT STATUS:

The topic is still up for discussion.

III. Topic Summary: Public and Civic Uses

A Planning Commission recommendation was to have separate requirements for Public and Civic uses since they are built spaces rather than land area requirements. In an effort to provide flexibility and achieve more usable spaces, Staff recommended combining the minimum percentage of Parks and Open Spaces and Public and Civic uses for Office Clusters and the Route 28 Business

area. Stakeholders expressed that the minimum 5 percent civic requirement currently called for in the Revised General Plan is often hard to achieve with smaller projects and the provided spaces do not function as usable, meaningful spaces. To address this concern, Staff recommended combining the Parks and Open Space and Public and Civic use requirement for those land use patterns that do not include Residential uses (Office Clusters and Route 28 Business area) in an effort to achieve more meaningful spaces. To address the Planning Commission's comment regarding the varying measurements of land area vs. square footage, Staff included Public and Civic uses in the land use mix table for Office Clusters and a note to the table stating that, if proposed, Public and Civic buildings may count towards meeting the minimum 15% requirement.

CURRENT PROPOSAL:

Staff amended the draft plan to require at least 2% of the recommended land use mix square footage for Public and Civic uses within Mixed-Use Office Centers to be provided on-site, and an additional 3% to be provided either on-site or off-site, in addition to the anticipated Capital Facilities contributions associated with the Mixed-Use Office Centers.

IV. Topic Summary: Waivers for Public/Civic Uses

A Planning Commission recommendation was to consider allowing, especially for smaller projects, a larger percentage of the Parks and Open Spaces and Public and Civic use requirement to be waived if the cash-in-lieu is used towards Parks and Open Space and/or Public and Civic uses adjacent to the development. The ability to waive a certain percentage of the Parks and Open Space and Public and Civic use requirement would be subject to a County-approved Public/Civic Facilities Plan. Since all developments, with the exception of Mixed-Use Office Centers, may provide a combination of Parks and Open Spaces and Public and Civic uses, Staff maintained that no more than one-third of the requirement should be satisfied offsite to ensure that each development has some usable space for the enjoyment of the users of the development. Subject to the Public/Civic Facilities Plan, the County may wish to consider whether smaller projects may waive a larger percentage of the Parks and Open Space and Public and Civic use requirement when the cash-in-lieu is used proximate to the site.

CURRENT PROPOSAL:

Based on direction from the Planning Commission at the December 8, 2010 worksession, the Commission will recommend to the Board that the development of a Public/Civic Facilities Plan, which includes identifying the mechanisms for off-site contributions, be a priority within the CPAM strategic plan for implementation. A new policy was also included in the draft plan's implementation section to include such direction. The Planning Commission may still consider whether, subject to the Public/Civic Facilities Plan, the County may allow smaller projects to waive a larger percentage of the Parks and Open Space

and Public and Civic use requirement when the cash-in-lieu is used proximate to the site.

E. Sustainable Development

I. Planning Commission Recommendation

Require 65 percent phosphorous removal for all development.

Staff Recommendation

State Code addresses the required percentage of phosphorous removal. Because this type of requirement is more appropriate in the Facilities Standards Manual rather than a policy document, staff suggests it not be included in the draft plan amendment.

UPDATE:

The topic is still up for discussion.